The ADA and Stuart Hughes, P. 4

Walter and the House Un-Americans Suffer Their First Legislative Defeat in Years, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 35 OCTOBER 1, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How *Do* You Crush An Inspiration?

At the close of a TV program last Sunday, Sept. 23, Senator Keating of New York, one of the worst of the Republican war hawks, asked Gen. Lucius D. Clay a cute question. "As a military man," Senator Keating said, "do you recognize that the weapons that they have in Cuba could be used either offensively or defensively?" The question was designed to undercut the President's assurances that the arms in Cuba were defensive. Gen. Clay might have replied tartly that only a civilian could ask such a question. Obviously a shotgun can be used "offensively" even against an H-bomb installation if anybody with a shotgun could get close enough, but that doesn't make the H-bomb a defensive nor the shotgun an offensive weapon when one confronts the other. Instead Gen. Clay gave an answer which goes to the heart of the Cuban problem. "I'm not too concerned," he diasppointed Keating by replying, "about the Cuban situation as an offensive threat against the United States. But the possibility that it could become the base for the inspiration of revolutions in other parts of Central and South America is very real and one that cannot be discounted."

Do You Use the Marines or SAC?

So the question is: how *do* you crush an inspiration? The Joint Resolution passed by the Senate does indeed empower the President "to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." But what if Cuba is not so foolish as to challenge a giant neighbor's overwhelming power by using force or threat of force? What if it operates, as Gen. Clay fears, by "inspiration"? How do you crush an inspiration? Do you use the Marines? Or the Strategic Air Command? We could destroy Cuba—utterly—within an hour. But how destroy its memory in the hearts of Latin America's kindred millions? Cuba, left alone, *really left alone* honorably to work out its destiny, may prove disappointing to their hopes; it may disillusion the rest of the hemisphere; it may shift back, if we allow it, to friendly relations and a mixed rather than a Communist society. But crushed by American power, its inspiration would live on in the most idealized form among the Latin hungry and oppressed, the legend of Castro, the Latin American David who defied the Yankee Goliath, who took the sugar lands to give his people bread and dared seize the oil refineries when their foreign masters refused to obey Cuba's laws.

We are, let us remember, the rich man in a huge hemispheric slum. There never was a greater challenge to our capacity to think quietly and step warily than in this Cuban affair. Against this background, what happened in the Senate looks like the attempt of a cautious President to throw sops to an unthinking mob in the hope of controlling it. The Cuban resolution and the 150,000 reservists may be seen as gestures to appease a mindless clamor for *action,* to buy time for wiser policies. But when will braver men in the Senate speak out for them?

The only way to combat an inspiration is with another inspiration. But to the inspiration of Castro's daring we counterpose only the spectacle of a deep weakness and a dangerous drift. Only an America prepared to subordinate its private big business interests to the welfare of the hemisphere, determined to abide by its treaty commitments of non-intervention, under leadership strong enough to make peace with Cuba, could provide an inspiration vital enough to counter the one Gen. Clay fears.

Mississippi's Moise Tshombe

As this issue was being sent to the printer, tribal warfare seemed to have spread from the Congo to Mississippi. It is too late to fight a new war between the States and it looks as if Governor Ross Barnett will get his chance to be photographed behind the bars of a Federal prison. Now Mr. Kennedy will really have a useful task for those 150,000 reservists, and we believe that if action is swift and firm, and the armed forces sent into Mississippi overwhelming, this will be the last stand of the segregationists in the South.

This would be the time for a joint resolution upholding law and order. It's easy getting a resolution shaking fists at Castro. The Congress rises as one. National unity is the watchword. Nobody is afraid of war, especially ancient warhorses too old to fight. But ask these muscle-flexers for a vote against the mob in Mississippi and see how few volunteer for active service. Nor do we expect to hear any intrepid Senator ask Eastland how come in all his years of hunting subversive threats to internal security he never once seemed to notice the racists who now venture on insurrection in the South, nor the White Citizens Councils whose chief is at Governor Barnett's elbow and who advocate force and violence against orders of the Federal government. Indeed in Mississippi the forces of *order seem to interlock with the forces of disorder.* We notice from the news dispatches that Sheriff Ford in Lafayette County is also chairman of the county White Citizens Councils. His jurisdiction extends over Oxford and the University. The jeering faces of Ole Miss's student body attest its high scholarly character, and we marvel at the handful of Negroes who dared turn out among them to cheer Meredith when he tried to register. This Air Force Veteran, prepared to walk alone as a student into that howling mob of racist imbeciles, deserves a Congressional Medal of Honor, as one of the heroes of our time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report from the UN: As Cold War Flares Up, Prestige of the Big Two Goes Down

Our Tantrums Over Cuba Making Us Ludicrous at the United Nations

I brought back several impressions from the opening sessions of the UN General Assembly in New York. One is that the United States is making itself ludicrous by its attitude toward Cuba. We look like a college fullback in a tantrum because a 3-year old stuck its tongue out at him. We claim to be the strongest power in the world. We shoot at Venus and have pushbuttons that can destroy—at least so we claim—everything in the Soviet Union, down to the last cowshed. And here we are in a state of hysteria because a tiny island neighbor we have long been threatening has received defensive weapons which, fired slantwise, can reach targets all of 25 miles away. Our Secretary of State dashes to New York to pressure our allies not to let ships take supplies to Cuba, though such action would be in violation of the international law we're always claiming to champion and of the UN Charter which, like the Bogota Pact, pledges non-intervention in other countries' internal affairs. Our delegate, Adlai Stevenson, once a national asset, a memento of Wilsonian standards, now becomes more and more a mouthpiece for stale State Department quack-quack, gets himself involved in an exchange of insults opening day with Cuba, an exchange he initiated. When are we going to act our age and size?

Pot-and-Kettle Controversy

The second impression is that most of the other delegates, from large countries and small, are sick of the cold war, which flared up with fresh virulence at the opening sessions. Almost everything of which the Americans and Russians accuse each other is true, for they each do or try to do the same things where they can get away with it, one in Eastern Europe, the other in Latin America. I never heard an argument more completely pot-and-kettle than the day Stevenson rose to answer Gromyko. When Gromyko brought up Cuba, we brought up Hungary. The inference drawn by bystanders is that both big powers are self-righteous bullies whose angry recriminations are destroying the UN as a forum for sensible discussion, heating up the arms race, and diverting more funds from the pitifully small amounts available for the war on that hunger from which most of the world's peoples still suffer. The longer this goes on, the lower the prestige of both big Powers will fall. I am convinced that either Washington or Moscow could register a propaganda victory if it suddenly lowered its voice, understated its case, disarmingly admitted its own shortcomings and then made a few constructive proposals for practical first steps toward a more peaceful world. Mr. Kennedy, to his credit, tried for a new tone in Russo-American relations at the start of his Administration and there was some reply in kind from Moscow, but since Vienna there has been steady deterioration. Now at the UN one can feel the storm rising.

The third impression is that the Russians came to the UN better prepared. There was much in the Gromyko speech which left a sour impression—his insistence on the right to test last, his paranoid rejection of zonal inspection as merely espionage, the sheer nonsense of declaring that in West Germany today "you will hardly note any significant difference" from the Third Reich and his demagogy on the Congo. But he also came armed with proposals of wide appeal. The draft declaration on what could be done with resources released by disarmament will appeal to the poor ex-colonial countries. So will the proposal for an International Conference on Trade Problems as a counter to the Common Market which most of Asia, Africa and Latin America fear as a rich man's preserve, restricting their own precarious exports. The Soviet draft declaration on preventive war puts us on the spot by calling for a mutual pledge not to use nuclear arms first and by condemning the use of force "against peoples that have taken the road of national liberation and development."

More Basic Than East-West Conflict

"The East-West conflict is likely to continue for a considerable period of time. Nevertheless, it is my hope that we shall live to see this conflict recede and eventually prove to be a passing phase in human history. . . . At the same time, the developed part of the world, both East and West, must concentrate sufficient attention on a problem which may ultimately prove to be of even greater danger to mankind—the gap between the rich and the poor."

—Mr. Lange, Norway, UN Gen. Assembly, Sept. 21.

Brazil Sees The Poor Growing Poorer and The Cold War An Obstacle to Their Hopes

"The truth is that the condition of the underdeveloped nations tends to deteriorate rather than to improve, for in the majority of cases the rate of development does not keep pace with population growth. Moreover, thanks to . . . the successful efforts of regional exchange organizations established among the developed countries, the underdeveloped countries which do not participate in such arrangements are witnessing the progressive deterioration of the value on the international market of their raw materials and basic commodities which forces them to work harder and harder for less and less.

"In the last ten years the foreign aid granted our continent was much less than the losses incurred through the decline in the value of its products. . . .

"The ideal of international order is to achieve peace and prosperity for all people. Peace is based on disarmament and prosperity depends upon technical and financial assistance to the underdeveloped countries. Neither disarmament nor development can be really attained on the basis of cold war and competition between blocs of hostile ideologies. Brazil, a Western and Christian country, with a long standing democratic tradition, does not intend to part with its formative values. However, it is precisely to remain loyal to these values that Brazil seeks to contribute to the elimination of the divergencies between the world blocs. . . . Disarmament and development depend on this elimination. Without prejudice to the execution of regional plans such as the Alliance for Progress, we wish to stimulate unbiased international aid to the underdeveloped countries. . . .

"The freedom of peoples is another prerequisite of international co-existence. . . . Non-intervention and self-determination are not mutually exclusive, they are mutually complementary. In the light of these concepts, if properly applied, the most serious political problems of today, such as those of Germany, Cuba and Southeast Asia can be solved."*—Mr. de Melo Franco, Brazil, at the UN Sept. 20.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUAC Loses on Bill to Permit "Faceless Informer" Discharges in Arms Plants

Walter and the House Un-Americans Suffer Their First Defeat in Years

For the first time anyone on the Hill can remember, Chairman Walter of the House Un-American Activities Committee has met defeat in trying to get a Committee bill through the House. Usually HUAC measures are treated as non-controversial in that few members dare to "controverse" them. Mr. Walter in his imperial fashion is accustomed to win their passage on the consent calendar, or—if some intrepid soul rises to block unanimous consent—then under suspension of the rules, when more than one-third of the members must record themselves against the feared Inquisition to prevent passage.

Until Wednesday, Sept. 19, the highest vote against an HUAC measure since the cold war began was six, but on that day 132 members voted "nay" on HR 11363, which would have made it possible to revoke the security clearance—and therefore take away the jobs—of some 5,000,000 workers in defense industry and scholars in arms research institutes without giving them a chance to face their accusers. This was six votes more than the one-third required to block the measure. A few minutes earlier another Walter HUAC measure, allowing summary discharge without hearing of any kind for employes of the super-secret National Security Agency, was passed under suspension of the rules but even then no less than 24 members voted against it.

How the Battle Was Won

There were three factors in Mr. Walter's defeat. The first was the opposition of the AFL-CIO which for once went to bat on a civil liberties issue. The second lay in a series of editorial protests by the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* against the bill as a "faceless informer" measure contrary to American tradition. The third was a round robin letter sent all members of the House by six courageous colleagues, three Republicans and three Democrats; the former, Lindsay of New York, Curtis of St. Louis and MacGregor of Minneapolis; the latter, Cohelan and Roosevelt of California and Reuss of Wisconsin.

The fight against both Walter bills was led by John V. Lindsay, a young maverick Republican of unusual ability. Mr. Lindsay before his election to Congress four years ago was in the Department of Justice. Mr. Lindsay rallied support against the industrial security bill on the ground that so important a measure, involving so large a sector of industry, should not be put to the House under suspension of the rules, when no amendments are permitted and only 40 minutes of debate allowed. Walter and the HUAC's ranking Republican, Scherer of Ohio, were startled to find conservatives like Judd, Derwinski, Gross and Alger voting against them.

At the time Mr. Lindsay first blocked passage of the Walter Industrial Security bill by unanimous consent last May, Mr. Walter promised full debate. But no witnesses were permitted to oppose the bill before the House Un-American Committee, which had heard only Defense, Justice and Labor for it and Mr. Walter twice tried to slip it through on the consent calendar last August, but was blocked by Mr. Lindsay. Ryan and Rosenthal of New York joined in the floor fight against the measure, and Chairman Celler of House Judiciary voted with the young liberals against both bills.

The Supreme Court (in *Greene v. McElroy*) in 1959 ruled against "faceless informer" loyalty-security procedures but left open the question of whether they would be constitutional if specifically authorized by the President or Congress. Eisenhower issued an executive order reintroducing them in 1960, and Congressional approval would strengthen their status on appeal. Kennedy ran on a platform pledging no more use of "faceless informers" but the Administration joined hands with Mr. Walter in trying to enact the bill. Mr. Walter may yet try to get a rule from his ally, Chairman Smith of House Rules and try to slip it through during the hectic closing days of this session but it is too late for Senate action, and cannot be enacted this year.

The Dual Function of Due Process

"My concern is not only that innocent people are unjustly accused and dismissed, but also that the agency itself will not be able to make an intelligent or rational decision *without some form of hearing.* Due process does not have meaning and value alone to the unjustly accused. It also is essential for an institution or individual that makes the determination."

—Rep. Jeff Cohelan (D. Cal) in the House Sept. 17.

Administration Accused of Violating 1960 Platform Pledge Against Faceless Informers

"I think those on the majority [Democratic] side ought to be ashamed of this bill. . . . This legislation is actively pushed by the administration, by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General, in contravention of the Democratic platform of 1960 which said:

" 'We shall provide full and fair hearing including confrontation of the accuser to any person whose public or private employment or reputation is jeopardized by a loyalty or security proceeding.'

"I think we ought to remember that if we enact this bill, particularly under this procedure, which does not allow full debate and which does not allow amendments to be offered, that we are establishing a precedent which has never in history been established by the Congress of the United States when it comes to the right of employment of individuals in the private arena. . . .

"HR 11363 gives the Government the right to determine who shall be hired and fired. . . . If such power is necessary, it should be surrounded by adequate safeguards so that the Government cannot act in an arbitrary . . . manner. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Scherer, ranking Republican on House Un-American] said in the hearings:

" 'I think the President, as Commander in Chief, has the right to do what he wants with classified information of this Government, and he should be able to prevent a person from having classified information if he doesn't like the way he parts his hair. . . .'

"If this point of view should ever come to pass, then we will be one step nearer to the horrible world vision so powerfully expressed in Kafka's terrifying novel, 'The Trial' . . . a world where an apparently innocent man is arrested for a crime whose nature he is never able to ascertain, and then put to death by a capricious, anonymous bureaucracy without every determining the reasons for this punishment or ever being able to confront his accusers. . . ."

—Rep. John V. Lindsay (R. N.Y.) in the House Sept. 17.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mass. Leadership Undecided on Support of Stuart Hughes for U.S. Senate

Will the ADA Sit Out the Country's Most Important Peace Campaign?

Urgent Memo to Readers in the ADA: In one overriding respect, the most important Senate campaign next month will be in Massachusetts. Only in Massachusetts will there be an independent peace candidate for the Senate. The size of the vote for Stuart Hughes will have nationwide impact. A low vote will be a disaster; it will hurt the morale of the peace forces; it will be taken as a sign by cautious politicians that to speak out uncompromisingly for peace is politically hopeless. On the other hand, a big vote for Hughes will encourage fresh voices elsewhere. The fact that 1500 volunteers could gather 150,000 votes and put him on the election ballot was itself news that invigorated the peace forces everywhere. If he could now poll 300,000 votes or, better still, in a hot contest make off with the election, that would be taken as a sign that there is a strong peace undercurrent, despite the tension and hysteria built up by the press and irresponsible politicoes, especially on Cuba.

ADA Opposed Ted Kennedy

In this juncture, what will the ADA in Massachusetts do? It opposed Ted Kennedy. It cannot support Lodge, a right wing Republican in foreign policy. Will it back the independent candidate or stultify itself by swallowing its own bitter criticism of Ted Kennedy's ineptitude? Or, worse yet, will it stand aside, endorsing no one, counting itself out of this crucial contest? Unless there is strong pressure from the rank and file, the Massachusetts leadership is apt to decide to sit this election out. This is an appeal to our ADA readers everywhere in the country to write and urge their organization to endorse Hughes for the U.S. Senate.

As a gesture of encouragement, especially if you live in Massachusetts, send a note to the Hughes headquarters at 56 Boylston St., Cambridge 38, telling them you have written and will support Hughes whatever the ADA leaders decide.

Pulling No Punches

"What then is the challenge Cuba poses? A Socialist economy: For the underdeveloped nations, some kind of collectivized economy may be the most effective way of achieving rapid growth. It is the sovereign right of every nation to decide its own economic and social system. Soviet influence in the Western Hemisphere: Cuba has trade and diplomatic relations with the USSR. Since we have cut off trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba, only Russian influence remains. I therefore propose that we declare our willingness to co-exist with Castro's Cuba; that we resume normal trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba; that we permit Americans to travel freely to Cuba; and that we include Cuba in the Peace Corps Program and the Alliance for Progress, and that we seek a treaty to declare Cuba a neutral zone: that is, no bases, Russian or American, would be permitted on Cuban soil."

—From a leaflet by Stuart Hughes, independent candidate for U.S. Senate in Massachusetts.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF I. F. Stone's Weekly published 48 times a year at Washington, D. C. for 1960. 1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor, I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.; Business Manager Esther M. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Esther M. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Celia M. Gilbert, Cambridge, Mass. Jeremy J. Stone, White Plains, N.Y. Christopher D. Stone, Chicago, Ill. 3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: none. 4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. 5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly and triweekly newspapers only.) 18,521. Signed, I. F. Stone. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of September 1962. Alvin Bernstein, Notary Public, Washington, D. C. (My commission expires 7-31-1967.)

Don't Forget Our Offer: A Free Copy to A Friend If You Send A Stamped LONG Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/1/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED